

School of Public Administration
Annual Evaluation Criteria
Approved by the D.F. Schmidt College of Arts and Letters on 2/26/24

I. ANNUAL EVALUATION POLICY.

The mission of the School of Public Administration is to provide an intellectual, analytical, technical, and practical education to advance the state of knowledge in public administration and to enhance ethical public service within our service region.

<https://www.fau.edu/artsandletters/public-administration/about/mission/> To achieve this mission and ensure that faculty can provide an intellectual, technical, and practical education, we adopt these policies and procedures establishing the criteria for conducting annual evaluations of faculty and instructors in the School.

This document establishes the standards by which the Director of the School of Public Administration is to conduct annual evaluations for faculty and instructors. The Director's annual evaluation shall be based on instruction, research, and service consistent with School promotion and tenure criteria. Moreover, based on the criteria established herein, the Director shall determine if a faculty member or instructor performed exceptionally, outstanding, good, needs improvement, or unsatisfactorily since their last annual evaluation.

The Director shall understand that the annual evaluation process is a limited cross-section of a faculty member or instructor's academic career. In preparing the annual evaluation, the person(s) responsible for evaluating the employee may consider, where appropriate, information from the following sources: immediate supervisor, peers, students, employee/self, and other University officials who have responsibility for supervision of the employee, and individuals to whom the employee may be responsible in the course of a service assignment. Although annual evaluations are an important part of promotion and tenure decisions, they are not all that is considered when making promotion and tenure decisions. Therefore, faculty and instructors are encouraged to review the School's promotion and tenure criteria.

Annual evaluations are based on the faculty member or instructor's annual assignment. Each annual evaluation shall be based on twelve (12) contact hours of instruction or equivalent, where it is assumed that one 3 credit course is equivalent to 10 hours of work per week (Collective Bargaining Agreement – 2022-2025).). If a faculty member is assigned a 3-2 teaching load, the Director must weigh each component of the evaluation appropriately..

Based on these established principles, the Director shall take into account:

- i. faculty and instructors have varying responsibilities as reflected in their annual assignments;
- ii. faculty and instructors can make essential contributions to the University, College, and School's mission in various ways, and that the nature of an individual's contributions may vary over time;
- iii. innovative scholarly work may take time to bear fruit, and may sometimes fail;
- iv. unusual or unpopular scholarship, teaching, and service are not by themselves sufficient cause for a negative evaluation;

v. neither unethical conduct nor malfeasance will be tolerated.

The following table will be used to evaluate each faculty member and instructor each year.

Table 1: Rating/Assignment Table

Annual Evaluation Form School of Public Administration Academic Year NAME			
	Rating (R)	Percentage of Assignment (A)	R*A
Instruction			
Scholarship			
Service			
Total			
	5=Exceptional 4= Outstanding 3= Good 2=Needs Improvement 1=Unsatisfactory	Based on Annual Assignment data for the Evaluation Year	

In addition to the evaluation form, the Director can include a narrative describing how the rating for each of the evaluation components was determined based on the established criteria. The report will be conveyed to the individual faculty member through the Director who may add her/his qualitative assessment of accomplishments and deficiencies.

This policy document can be reviewed and changed accordingly when requested by a simple majority of the voting SPA faculty and instructors. Moreover, if University or College policy changes impact the conditions established herein, this policy document will be reviewed and amended if necessary and approved by a simple majority of the faculty and instructors in the School.

II. RESEARCH

Given that instructors are not rated based on research, this section pertains exclusively to tenure-earning or tenured faculty in the School.

The School is most interested in faculty demonstrating a consistent pattern of scholarship in which, for example, conference papers eventually turn to publications; data gathered is eventually analyzed and presented in academic outlets; and scholarship demonstrates a connected body of knowledge. This pattern is the essence of a scholarly career, and these criteria – as well as the School’s promotion and tenure criteria – are organized around it.

Untenured faculty should focus particularly on standards for research productivity as measured by publication. They should be sure to review the School’s promotion and tenure criteria annually, as they prepare their annual reports, and attend carefully to feedback in the annual

appraisal of progress towards tenure and their 3rd year review. An appropriate level of peer-reviewed publication is essential to a favorable tenure review.

Tenured faculty are expected to maintain an ongoing and consistent pattern of scholarship but, as a consequence of the more varied assignments and commitments of tenured faculty, are more able to plan for a periodic hiatus in publication as they take on more service in the School, college, university, and profession.

For the purpose of the annual evaluation, the faculty members will use the SCImago Journal & Country Rank index, Google Scholar ranking, Web Science or other information to determine the top nature of the journal within the area of research. Authorship order should be indicated and faculty may provide a brief description of their role/contribution. Peer-review, blind-review should be clearly indicated and faculty may choose to provide information on the quality of a journal article which can be based, for example, on a measure from Journal Citation Reports®, cited reputational rankings, or other justified criteria

- i. *Exceptional*. A ranking of exceptional requires one of the following requirements **and** two or more of the requirements from those listed to achieve a rating of “outstanding.” or if a faculty achieves two of the following, they will be rated as exceptional
 - a. Publication of an article in a Q1 ranked journal, or two articles published in Q2 ranked journals.
 - b. Acceptance of a book manuscript or publication of a book with peer review independent of the institution. The published book may be submitted for a second year.
 - c. Federal/state competitive institutional grant received as a result of an external review process from a major granting agency (e.g., NSF, NEH, or other federal agency, Fulbright, major foundation, etc.).
 - d. Acceptance or publication of a textbook.
 - e. Presentation of research at an international academic or professional conference.
 - f. Recognition by academic peers for scholarly achievement via awards or other professional recognition (e.g., Best Paper in an academic peer-reviewed journal, Best Paper for a peer-reviewed award at an academic conference).
- ii. *Outstanding*. A ranking of outstanding requires one of the following **and** two or more of the requirements from those listed to achieve a rating “good” or if a faculty member achieves two of the following they will be rated outstanding:
 - a. Publication of an article in a Q2 ranked journal, or two articles published in Q3 ranked journals.
 - b. Publication of a book without an anonymous peer review process. The book may be submitted for a second year if two or more favorable reviews are provided as evidence of quality.
 - c. A book chapter; edited book or anthology; monograph; book review essays;

- article in non-peer reviewed journals (rank three).
 - d. Substantive review(s) of a published book that has received an Exceptional evaluation in previous years.
 - e. Presentation of research at national academic or professional conferences.
 - f. Writing and submission of external grants to a federal/state agency that are peer-reviewed.
 - g. Article or book chapter under review
 - h. More than one publication **in a Q1 ranked journal** in the previous evaluation year
 - i. Publication of an article in a ranked journal with graduate or undergraduate student coauthor.
 - j. Securing a competitive internal or minor external grant for research
- iii. *Good*. A ranking of good requires two or more of the requirements from those listed below:
 - a. Publication of an article in a Q3 ranked journal.
 - b. Presentation of research at regional conferences.
 - c. Manuscript submission for review in a ranked journal.
 - d. Completion of data collection for a project.
 - e. Publication of a technical report demonstrating scholarly and/or community involvement.
- iv. *Needs Improvement*. No evidence of continuing research or creative activities or efforts to develop research projects. The designation of “Needs Improvement” serves as an indication to the faculty member that future progress in this category is expected.
- v. *Unsatisfactory*. To merit the rating of “Unsatisfactory,” the faculty member must demonstrate performance that fails to meet School expectations. Failure to improve in the year after receiving a “Needs Improvement” rating will result in a rating of “Unsatisfactory.”

III. **TEACHING**

The School recognizes that instruction incorporates a broad range of activities along with teaching. As a result, both qualitative and quantitative data will be used when evaluating a faculty member or instructor’s instructional accomplishments and to assess overall performance in this area of the assignment.

The sections below outline the activities the Director will consider in the evaluation of instruction.

The basic elements of instructional work are in assigned classes, and its quality should be assessed through an evaluation including:

- i. Student perceptions of teaching (SPOT) that are provided by the university.

- ii. Peer review. A faculty member or instructor should be reviewed by a tenured member of the School as assigned by the Director in consultation with the faculty member. The review may be based on syllabi and other appropriate teaching materials, and should include classroom/course observation. The observation must be scheduled ahead of time by the Director in consultation with the faculty member.
- iii. Course syllabi, tests, and other course materials.
- iv. Evidence of the development of new courses, curriculum, or programs, including the revision of courses and the development of new teaching methods.
- v. Teaching and advising awards.
- vi. Advising.
- vi. Participation in professional development activities relating to pedagogy, publishing on teaching, or formal presentations concerning teaching and learning.
- vii. Chairing or serving on dissertation committees.
- viii. Supervising/mentoring students in research papers or projects.
- ix. Contributions to the School's teaching mission taking into consideration items such as:
 - a. required or elective courses
 - b. undergraduate or graduate courses
 - c. class size
 - d. number of course preparations
 - e. serving as faculty advisor for student groups and/or organizing School student events and activities with those groups
 - f. new courses/preparations
 - g. the use of innovative teaching methods and technologies

III. Rating Criteria.

The School recognizes that how the Director will evaluate instructional accomplishments vary according to the faculty member or instructor's experience. For example, untenured faculty are expected to focus on developing their classroom teaching; the School expects the newly-hired faculty member to use their first few years at FAU to develop both a teaching repertoire and sufficient familiarity with FAU students' characteristics to be able to design effective classes.

As faculty members and instructors acquire more teaching experience, the School expects them to expand their instructional roles: for instance, by mentoring students, serving on program committees, participating in School, college, and university curriculum committees and supporting junior faculty or new instructors in their instructional development.

Exceptional. A ranking of *Exceptional* requires a score at or below 1.85 on the student perceptions of teaching forms for Item #6 and at or below 1.85 or the mean of means for items 1-5 for all classes taught by faculty/instructor during the year (contextual factors such as course difficulty and grade inflation can be taken into account) **and** two of the following:

- a. Strong peer reviews

- b. Recognition via University or Extramural Teaching Award.
 - c. Chairing of successful doctoral committee
 - d. External grants received for an instructional program or related activities.
 - e. Development and adoption of a new for-credit course not taught elsewhere or an extensive redesign of existing courses along highly innovative lines.
 - f. Development of new degree programs or development of for-credit courses.
 - g. Mentoring junior faculty in teaching and/or instructional activities resulting in significant identifiable improvement in teaching performance.
 - h. Acquiring Quality Matters certification for an online course
 - i. Supervising/mentoring enrolled undergraduate and/or graduate students who receive awards or have published their research papers or projects;
- ii. *Outstanding*. A ranking of *Outstanding* requires scores between 1.85 and 2.6 on the student perceptions of teaching forms for Item #6 and between 1.85 and 2.6 for the mean of means for items 1-5 for all classes taught by faculty/instructor during the year (contextual factors such as course difficulty and grade inflation can be taken into account) **and** two of the following:
- a. Good internal/external peer reviews
 - b. Nomination for University or Extramural Teaching Award.
 - c. Submission of an external/internal grant proposal for instructional program or related activities.
 - d. Chairing of a doctoral committee.
 - e. Member of a successful doctoral committee
 - f. Developing new online instructional activities including a course or courses offered entirely online
 - g. Developing and delivering community-based instruction, such as onsite courses, clinical experiences, professional internships and collaborative programs.
 - h. Presentation in pedagogy workshops
 - i. Supervising/mentoring enrolled undergraduate and/or graduate students for research papers or projects.
- iii. *Good*: A ranking of *Good* requires scores between 2.7 and 3.1 on the student perceptions of teaching forms for Item #6 and between 2.7-3.1 for the mean of means for items 1-5 for all classes taught by faculty/instructor during the year (contextual factors such as course difficulty and grade inflation can be taken into account) **and** two of the following:
- a. Supervision of Directed Independent Study or internship.
 - b. Participation in a doctoral committee or supervision of Directed Independent Research/Studies for undergraduate and Masters students.
 - c. Presence of evaluation of teaching by departmental peer reviewers.

- d. Developing and delivering instruction to communities and other constituencies (such as a community Workshop/seminar presentation to a local government).
 - e. Other criteria as defined by faculty
- iv. *Needs Improvement.* No evidence of improvement in teaching scores or pedagogical activities.
- a. The designation of “Needs Improvement” serves as an indication to the faculty member that future progress in this category is expected.
- v. *Unsatisfactory.* To merit the rating of “Unsatisfactory,” the faculty member must demonstrate performance that fails to meet School expectations. Failure to improve in the year after receiving a “Needs Improvement” rating will result in a rating of “Unsatisfactory.”

IV.. SERVICE

Service consists of those activities not clearly defined under teaching and research which contribute to the public service of the School, college, university, profession and community. Service includes activities for which no significant compensation has been received and which contribute to student activities outside the classroom, to the department, the academic profession; and to governmental local, national or international communities.

Criteria for untenured faculty members. Untenured faculty members are expected to focus primarily on service to the School with perhaps membership on at least one college committee or task force prior to consideration for tenure. Untenured faculty may receive “Outstanding” or “Exceptional” ratings based solely upon their service to the department.

All tenured faculty members are expected to: serve on school, college, and university committees; attend and participate in School events and recruitment, attend School meetings, and important college and university activities; and participate at least once during the academic year in commencement activities.

In addition to fulfilling all these department service activities satisfactorily, the rankings below require the following:

- i. *Exceptional.* A ranking of exceptional requires one of the following requirements **and** two or more of the requirements from those listed to achieve a rating of “outstanding”; or if a faculty achieves two of the following, they will be rated as exceptional.
 - a. Officer in an incorporated national or international scholarly or professional discipline-related organizations.
 - b. Chair of a program or member of a conference organizing committee for an international or national scholarly or academic conference.
 - c. Chairing of school, college, or university committee, institute or academy.
 - d. Editor of a scholarly journal

- e. Success in helping student extracurricular activities that received recognition for accomplishment
 - f. Participation as an official member in major international, federal, or state commissions, task forces, or boards.
 - g. Participation in three or more school, college, or/and university committees or committees that require an unusual time commitment.
 - h. Active with a very high level of participation in community engagement activities related to the profession.
 - i. Associate/managing editor of a scholarly journal.
 - j. Commendations or awards for outstanding service contributions to the profession or community.
- ii. *Outstanding.* A ranking of outstanding requires one of the following requirements **and** two or more of the requirements from those listed to achieve a rating of “good” or if a faculty achieves two of the following, they will be rated as exceptional.
- a. Officer in an incorporated state or regional scholarly or professional organization.
 - b. Program chair or member of a conference organizing committee for a major regional or national scholarly or professional conference.
 - c. Member of two school, college, or/and university committees.
 - d. Regularly reviews scholarly journal articles or books
 - e. Participates at academic conferences through such activities as a discussant or panel chair/organizer.
 - f. Participation as an official member in regional or county commissions, task forces, or boards.
 - g. Appointed position in a local or community professional or academic association or organization
 - h. Active with a high level of participation in community engagement activities.
 - i. Editorial Board member of scholarly journal.
- iii. *Good.:* A ranking of good requires two or more of the following indicators. Alternatively, a ranking of good requires one of the indicators listed for exceptional or outstanding and one of the following indicators:
- a. Officer in an incorporated local or university scholarly or professional Organization.
 - b. Member of a program or conference committee for a local scholarly or professional conference.
 - c. Member of a school committee.
 - d. Speeches or (Gratis) consulting for community and/or practitioner groups
 - e. Participation as an official member in local commissions, task forces, or boards.
 - f. Occasionally reviews scholarly articles or books
- iv. *Needs Improvement.* Low participation and initiative on school committees, and

university and professional activities. The designation of “Needs Improvement” serves as an indication to the faculty member that future progress in this category is expected.

- v. *Unsatisfactory.* To merit the rating of “Unsatisfactory,” the faculty member must demonstrate performance that fails to meet School expectations. Failure to improve in the year after receiving a “Needs Improvement” rating will result in a rating of “Unsatisfactory.”